

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of Jeffrey D. Flammer

Serial No.: 10/731,390

Filed: 12/08/03

For:

Group Art Unit: 2841

Examiner: PATEL, ISHWARBHAI B.

Attorney Docket No: P03951

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION WITH TRAVERSE**

Sir:

In response to a restriction requirement set forth in an Office action mailed 05/24/07, a provisional election with traverse is made by Applicant.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the present case the requirement for restriction is not proper. According to MPEP §803, “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner **must** examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions (Emphasis added).” Examining pending Claims 42-50 clearly would not be a serious burden on the examiner. First, Claim 42-45 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1. Second, Claims 47-50 comprise language that would not be a serious burden to search in addition to the other pending Claims.

Also, the Examiner has made a species restriction. The Examiner apparently submits that the species comprise two features: a first feature, Feature A, where the rigid layer comprises fiberglass, epoxy, or metal, and a second feature, Feature B, based on figure numbers.

With respect to the figures, applicant makes the following observations:

- FIGS. 1-11 illustrates a rigid-flex circuit board and a method of manufacturing rigid-flex circuit board
- FIGS. 12-13 illustrates rigid flex that is being laser drilled to create a 3-dimensional flexible circuit that is peeled away from rigid core portion
- FIGS. 14-15 illustrate rigid flex with laser stops embedded into the rigid flex
- FIGS. 17a-17k illustrates a rigid core portion that comprises a metal core

- FIGS. 18a-18e illustrate a metal support carrier to provide support for the manufacturing, processing and buildup of the flexible layers
- FIGS. 19a-19b illustrate a process for manufacturing rigid-flex
- FIGS. 20a-20e illustrate the rigid core portion having semiconductor material

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and that each of the claims presently pending in this application be examined. If the Examiner is not persuaded and persists with the restriction requirement, applicant provisionally elects species A1B1. Claim 1 is generic.

If there are any further fees necessitated by the foregoing communication please charge such fees, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-1887.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2007

/Michael D. Volk Jr./  
Michael Volk (59,338)  
Stoneman Law Offices, Ltd.  
3113 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85044  
Tel: (602)263-9200  
Facsimile: (602)277-4883  
Attorney for Applicant